



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/919,567

07/30/2001

John J. Dooley

005384.P002

4960

758

7590

04/17/2007

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

CUFF, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

04/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,567

Applicant(s)

DOOLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Cuff

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20061003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title; if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tantry et al. in view of DeLorme et al.

Tantry et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying the use of XML dotted notation and automatically generating a mapping table.

Tantry et al. shows, figure 6, an object-oriented architecture for factory floor management (supply chain network). There are multiple barcode readers (DSE), which are linked to communication managers (adapters). The combination of the two is a (SDA). Standard TCP/IP protocol is used (Universal Protocol). Database 66 is the data center. Application servers are the site servers and event handlers. Callback routines map user interactions from the X-server (X-events) to specific Application Engine functionality. Thus, Application Engines bridge the user interface widget library (description documents) with the factory services/factory object library.

The examiner takes Official Notice that the use of XML and dotted notation are old and well known and that it would be obvious to use them in order to take advantage of standardized methods.

Based on the discussion above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Tantry et al. system to use XML and dotted notation in order to take advantage of standardized methods.

DeLorme et al. teaches, figure 10, a computer aided map location system (the examiner notes to avoid confusion that even though the DeLorme et al. invention is drawn to geography maps, it also uses data mapping). The system's event handler (column 26, lines 31-43) uses a mapping data subsystem 210 (generating mapping automatically) and a mapping display subsystem 213 (the resultant table from the automatic mapping) in order to organize data inputs into a more usable format.

Based on the teaching of DeLorme et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the application servers (event handlers) of the Tantry et al. system to incorporate mapping data subsystem 210 and a mapping display subsystem 213 of DeLorme et al. in order to organize data inputs into a more usable format.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/29/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the examiner has not delineated the parts of the reference that apply to each individual claim. The examiner has complied with 37 CFR 1.104 (c)(2). The considers collecting specification information, gathering documents, creating documents, and executing an event handler clearly apparent even just from the abstract

Art Unit: 3627

of the prior art. The examiner has mapped out the structural comparisons between the prior art's language and the claim language. In light of this interpretation and reading of the prior art, the pertinence of the prior art is apparent.

Applicant asserts that the examiner does not discuss "a plurality of types of automated data source equipment". Due to the parallel nature of figure 6, the examiner thought that it was apparent that the x-term window 50 corresponded with the barcode device 57 as a second type of DSE. See column 9, lines 63-66, for how the electronic or automatic inputs of each are used in the system.

Applicant asserts that their "data center" is "a data processing system", which a database would not read upon. The examiner does not concur. As evidence, the examiner has provided a computer dictionary definition of a database. A database is a file composed of records, each containing fields together with a set of operations for searching, sorting, recombining and other functions. This meets the metes and bounds of a data processing system and/or a data center.

Applicant asserts that DeLorme does not disclose automatic generation of a mapping table ... in response to an event". The examiner does not concur. The bottom of figure 11 clearly shows "await next 'EVENT'", step 431, which indicates that the process is in response to an event. Column 26, lines 40-41, teaches "figure 10 and tables I, II, and III deal with mapping data subsystems 210 operations. See the routines in the tables. Almost all of the routines start off with an array (or table) of routines (mappings of data).

Art Unit: 3627

Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references. The examiner does not concur. Both references solve the same problem of processing input with stored data and provide useful information to the user. The use of a better organizational input system would have been obvious.

Pages 10-17 of the arguments reiterate similar arguments.

Suggestion

The examiner understands the difference between the invention and the prior art. The problem is that the claims are broad enough to allow proper application of the prior art. One possible way to overcome the current rejection could be to introduce the Description Document in the independent claim and link it to the generation of the mapping table, as supported by page 33 of applicant's specification. For example, claims 24 and 26 could read like:

(see next page)

Art Unit: 3627

24. (Previously Presented) A system in a supply chain network, the system comprising:

one or more site data appliances comprising one or more types of data source equipment, the one or more site data appliances configured to use a protocol to collect specification information, including event information, from the one or more types of data source equipment;

one or more site servers coupled to one or more site data appliances configured to gather the specification information from the one or more site data appliances,

to generate a Description Document, comprising the specification information of the one or more types of data source equipment; and

a data center coupled to the one or more site servers configured to automatically generate a mapping table, base on the Description Document information, which maps the event information of the one or more site data appliances, to event handlers for execution in response to an event.

26. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 24, wherein the one or more site servers [generate a Description Document, comprising the specification information of the one or more types of data source equipment using] use extensible markup language (XML).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Michael Cuff
April 10, 2007

MICHAEL CUFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER